

CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Peterson Renovation Request
Proposed Implementation Date:	Approx June 15, 2012
Proponent:	Kyle Peterson
Location:	Lease #3123 - Section 13, Township 31 North, Range 11 East All Suited (c. 220 acres)
County:	Hill County
Trust:	Common Schools

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The proponent is requesting permission to renovate approximately 220 acres of native rangeland on the State Land identified above in order improve forage production and increase trust income that has been impacted by dense clubmoss and Blue Gramma soil capping. The project will be done in thirds to fit in the lessees management plan.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT**1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:**

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

The Montana Department of Resources and Conservation/ Trust Lands Management Division (DNRC/TLMD) – Helena, MT and the Northeastern Land Office (NELO) have jurisdiction over this project.

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

DNRC/TLMD and NELO are not aware of any other agencies with jurisdiction or other permits needed to complete this project. Montana FWP and the Audobon Society are being scoped for their input.

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

Alternative A (No Action) – Under this alternative, the DNRC **does not** allow the proponent to renovate these acres to improve forage production.

Alternative B (the Proposed Action) – Under this alternative, the DNRC **does** allow the proponent to renovate these acres to improve forage production.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.*
- *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.*
- *Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

This tract and the surrounding area consist of flat to gently rolling plains with glacial till as parent material. These soils are well drained and more than eighty inches to any restrictive feature. There is minimal surface cobble and no erosion problems on any part of the tract. The soils in the proposed renovation are a Loam and Clay Loam past sixty inches. Soils have the potential to be very slightly saline.

No negative effects on the soil quality, stability or moisture are anticipated.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

No important groundwater resources are expected to be impacted.

No cumulative effects to the water resources are anticipated.

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

Renovation and farm equipment have the potential to generate airborne dust. These activities will minimally affect air quality for a very limited amount of time.

No cumulative effects to air quality are anticipated.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

The proposed renovation area is comprised of native rangeland plant communities and introduced communities.

If the renovation is approved an increase in Aums as well as a more favorable species composition would be expected.

No rare plants or cover types are present.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

The proposed renovation would cause a short-term reduction in habitat for terrestrial and avian species. The present condition of the range however would indicate that few species are present at this time.

Cumulative impacts of the proposed land renovation will be a long term increase in habitat for terrestrial and avian life. There will be little to no effect to aquatic life.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:

Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

There are no known federally listed threatened or endangered species in the proposed break area. No wetlands are present.

The Montana Natural Heritage Program lists the Loggerhead Shrike as a species of concern possibly in the project area. The shrike's habitat is primarily shrub land. The project area does not consist of the concerned species habitat.

The cumulative effects of the proposed renovation to the wildlife habitats and the associated Species of Concern would be minimal and short-term. Long term benefits to habitat would outweigh any short-term disturbances.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:

Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

The DNRC staff archaeologist conducted a Class III inventory of cultural and paleontologic resources of the area of potential effect. No cultural or paleontologic resources were identified. No additional archaeological investigative work is recommended.

Renovation of the ground surface will have No Effect to Antiquities as defined under the Montana State Antiquities Act.

11. AESTHETICS:

Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

The proposed renovation is not located on a prominent topographic feature.

The state land does not provide any unique scenic qualities.

The proposed activity will be conducted in a remote area, so there would be no change to the aesthetics in either alternative.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:

Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

No demands on limited resources are required for this project.

No direct or cumulative effects to environmental resources are anticipated.

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:

List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

There are no other projects or plans being considered on the tracts listed on this EA.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered. • Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading. • Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

- RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.
- Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.
- Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:

Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

There are some human safety risks associated with operating heavy machinery. The proponent and their employees accept these risks.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:

Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

There will be no impact to industrial or commercial activities.

The proposed project will help to reclaim an area of native rangeland closer to its climax potential.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:

Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

No cumulative effects to the employment market are anticipated.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:

Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

There are no direct or cumulative effects to taxes or revenue for the proposed project.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:

Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services

There will be no increases in traffic, no changes in traffic patterns, and no need for additional fire protection, or police services.

There will be no direct or cumulative effects on government services.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:

List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

There are no zoning or other agency management plans affecting these lands.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:

Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

There are no wilderness areas or access routes through this tract.

This area has public access from the county road and is used primarily for antelope and upland bird hunting. These recreational opportunities will be improved for the long term if proposal is approved.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:

Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing

The proposal does not include any changes to housing or developments.

No direct or cumulative effects to population or housing are anticipated.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:

Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

There are no native, unique or traditional lifestyles or communities in the vicinity that would be impacted by the proposal.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:

How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

The proposed renovation will increase the forage quality and quantity on this tract. This will provide more cover for all manner of wildlife and upland birds.

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:

Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

The proposed renovation has the potential to increase revenue to the trust over the current grazing conditions. The total amount will depend on quality of renovation, rainfall, time of rest after renovation, and the grazing plan implemented when grazing resumes again.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Monte McNally Title: Land Use Specialist
Signature: /s/ Monte N McNally	Date: 5/8/2012

V. FINDING**25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:**

I have selected the **Alternative B (Proposed Action)**, and recommend that the DNRC **does** allow the proponent to renovate the native rangeland.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

I have evaluated the potential environment affects and have determined that a long-term increase in range quality and subsequent increase in revenue to the State will result from the proposed activity.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:☐

EIS

☐

More Detailed EA

☒

No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name: Barny D. Smith
	Title: Unit Manager, Northeastern Land Office
Signature: /s/ Barny D. Smith	
Date: 5/9/2012	